

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.70020 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-608 Year-2019 Thana- SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-
Samastipur

=====

SONU SINGH @ KRISHNA KANT SINGH S/o Braj Bhushan Singh @
Randhir Singh Resident of Village- Udapatti @ Udapatti Bathua, P.S.-
Musarigharari, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sushil Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Choubey Jawahar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 27-07-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences

alleged under Sections 399 and 402 of the Indian Penal Code

and Sections 25(1-B)(a), 26 and 35 of the Arms Act, registered

in connection with Samastipur (Mufassil) P.S.Case No. 608 of

2019.

As per allegation, some criminals were planning to



commit some serious offences. The police raided the place of occurrence. Two miscreants were apprehended. They disclosed their names as Raushan Kumar and Kundan Kumar Mishra. They also disclosed the names of their associates who became successful in fleeing away as Sonu Jha and Sonu Singh @ Krishna Kant Singh, the present petitioner. A country-made pistol was recovered from the possession of Raushan Kumar and one loaded country-made pistol was also recovered from the possession of Kundan Kumar Mishra.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is not named in the FIR and his name has figured in the confessional statement of co-accused.

The petitioner has disclosed his criminal antecedent in paragraph no.3 of the bail petition which itself shows that he is accused in four cases including cases under Sections 392 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25(1-B)(a), 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

In my view, considering the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. His prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

If the petitioner surrenders and seeks regular bail before the court below, that shall be disposed of on its own



merit, without being prejudiced by this order.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

